



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE UNIFORM ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS IN ENGLISH

A BRIEF CHAPTER OF EDUCATIONAL HISTORY, TOGETHER WITH A SUMMARY OF THE FACTS SO FAR OBTAINED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND A LIST OF REFERENCES

THE UNSATISFACTORY RELATIONS OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS¹

The American high school is at present an educational storm center. Rapid readjustments are being made throughout the country, both in school and college, but nowhere else so rapidly as in the middle schools. And because the high schools are middle schools, they are influenced both from above and from below. On the one hand, they are called upon to shape their courses so as to articulate with the elementary schools, and on the other, so as to prepare young people for college. Moreover, being a public institution, the high school must respond to the pressure of opinion in the community and attempt to meet the needs and satisfy the ideals of those who support it.

The situation has been well described by ex-United States Commissioner Brown in his report for 1910. He says:

The high school indeed occupies a critical point in the center of the field, and different fires converge upon it. This is in part the reason why the high-school question is the one which reveals most clearly the change which, gradually and without observation, has been coming over our state system of educational administration, and out of which more obvious and organic changes are to come. [He states that in different portions of the country] the old-time controversy respecting the relations of public high schools to colleges and universities has been revived with more than its usual intensity. [It is freely charged by some that high schools are suffering from the dictation of the higher institutions.] Yet it is not merely a demand of the universities but a genuinely popular demand that our high schools should bridge the gap between the grammar schools and the colleges, offering to all pupils a well articulated series of educational opportunities, from the lowest to the highest. The admission requirements of the colleges have tended to hold the secondary schools up to a creditable grade of excellence, but every year the system

¹ This and the following section are taken, with certain omissions, from *English Problems*, No. 2, by James F. Hosis, published by Houghton Mifflin Co., Copyright, 1912.

becomes more unsatisfactory, and we must look forward to a time when it can be superseded by some different arrangement, which will be as good for the colleges and better for the schools. Now that a large part of the responsibility for college preparation falls to the public high schools, it is not to be forgotten that the college and university authorities, in prescribing their entrance requirements, are in effect passing legislation for the control of public education. It is of the utmost importance that such quasi legislation should be based on a broad understanding of the position and needs of the secondary school. There are those who fear that the high school as an institutional type may fall into disfavor unless it can readily adapt itself to the new needs of the time. It can, indeed, command the present situation if it can bring together its forces on a strong, progressive program. The situation is one that calls for patience but not for inaction. There is need of active effort for improvement. Continual readjustment must be made by both school and college.

Equally positive and disquieting is the view presented by President Pritchett in the report of the Carnegie Foundation for 1910. He finds that neither colleges nor secondary schools are satisfied with their relations to each other. The college complains that the graduates of the secondary schools are superficial and unwilling to apply themselves to hard work. The secondary school complains that, although the colleges fail to train their own pupils effectively, they dominate the teaching in the lower schools so as to introduce methods unfitted to boys and girls, and by their failure to recognize the newer subjects of study, they greatly hamper the high schools in the attempt to adjust themselves to the needs of their own communities. The chief influence of the college upon the high school is to make it a cramming place for the college. Even so, a majority of the students entering by examination fail to pass the test satisfactorily, and those who do often prove very poor students afterward.

Further testimony of like nature may be found in the recent reports of the National Education Association, in the periodicals, particularly the *School Review*, the *Outlook*, and the *Nation*, and in recent books on the high school and on the college. It is becoming clear to all that the problem of college-entrance requirements is an educational problem of great importance, and that the solution of it will require the sincere and intelligent co-operation of teachers and administrators in both school and college.

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REQUIREMENTS

The course in English in the American high school is now practically determined by the reports of the Uniform Conference on College-

Entrance Requirements in English, which meets at irregular intervals, usually once in two years. This body is made up of delegates from four associations of colleges and secondary schools, the Association of New England Colleges, and the College-Entrance Examination Board. At the last session, February 22, 1909, the membership included twelve college professors, two principals of eastern preparatory schools, and two principals of public high schools. Their report¹ includes a statement of the objects of preparation in English, suggestions as to the courses in grammar and composition and in literature, and a list of English classics, arranged in five groups, from each of which a candidate is expected to choose two for his examination upon entrance to college.

It will be recalled that the idea of a prescribed list of books originated in 1888 with the New England Commission on College-Entrance Requirements. When the Conference on English which was organized by the Committee of Ten, appointed by the National Education Association in 1892, met at Vassar College in December, it followed suit by recommending: "That the reading of certain masterpieces of English literature, not fewer in number than those at present assigned by the Commission of New England Colleges, should be required." The Conference further recommended that each of these masterpieces should be chosen to represent some period, tendency or type of literature; that the whole number of works for any year should set forth, with as few gaps as possible, the course of English literature from the Elizabethan period to the present time; that a considerable number of these works should be of a kind to be read cursorily outside of school, but that a limited number might be read under the immediate direction of the teacher; that the teachers should encourage the investigation of pertinent questions in literary history and criticism. The Conference went on record as opposed to "set essays" on the prescribed books, that is, essays merely to show that the pupil can write, and suggested that topics in literary history or criticism be chosen instead. Exercises in the correction of bad English, it declared, may do more harm than good. Admission in English should be made to depend largely upon the candidate's ability as shown in his various papers on other subjects. An examination in formal rhetoric should not be required.

The Committee of Ten clearly had in mind the practices then in vogue, particularly those of the New England colleges. Its action was followed by that of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. At the first meeting at Columbia

¹ See p. 115.

College on December 1 and 2, 1893, after listening to a paper by Mr. Wilson Farrand of Newark Academy, in which, among other matters, the lack of uniformity in entrance requirements in English was deplored, the society resolved that a joint committee of ten—five representing the colleges and five the preparatory schools—be appointed to consider the current usage and present a plan of reform at the next annual meeting. These delegates met and indorsed the recommendations of the Committee of Ten. Their rephrasing of the second recommendation is interesting. "Certain of these books should be of a kind to be *read* by the candidate *as literature*; others—a *limited number*—should be *carefully studied*¹ under the immediate direction of the teacher."

To make the recommendation effective, a list of books for "reading" and a separate list for "study" were selected for each of the years 1895 to 1898 inclusive.²

The New England Commission of Colleges and the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools were invited to send delegates to a conference with the Middle States committee in Philadelphia on May 17, 1894. Thus was born the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English. Its present composition has been explained above.

The National Education Association again took action. William Carey Jones of the University of California read a paper at the Denver meeting in 1895 on "What Ought to Be Done to Promote the Introduction of the Programs Recommended by the Committee of Ten?" A Committee on College-Entrance Requirements, made up of twelve college professors and secondary schoolmen, was appointed. This committee, through Dr. A. F. Nightingale, its chairman, reported in July, 1899, suggestions for all the high-school subjects. The section on English is noteworthy for three reasons: first, it recommends "that literature and composition be pursued side by side throughout the entire secondary-school course, and that they be so related throughout that one shall, in so far as possible, supplement and strengthen the other"; second, it includes a detailed course of study, prepared by Mr. W. F. Webster of Minneapolis, in which the principles of composition and of esthetic criticism which the pupils should master are laid down for each of the four years of the course; third, it contains a list of thirty

¹ Italics not in the original.

² This list has since been changed and enlarged from time to time, at the suggestion of secondary-school teachers, but the prescription of four or five books to be "closely studied" has been maintained throughout.

books for each of the four years, from which each teacher may choose. No attempt is made to prescribe which shall be "read" and which "studied." No doubt it was partly due to the influence of the National Education Association Committee that the National Conference was moved to adopt in 1895 and since then to extend a so-called "open list," which allows to the candidate considerable freedom of choice in the matter of books to be offered for the examination.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE ROUND TABLE

The complaints of the colleges and the work of the various committees and conferences referred to above undoubtedly had much to do with establishing the definite course in English which now everywhere continues throughout four, or at least three, of the years of the high-school period. But, as has already been indicated, dissatisfaction with this course, and especially with the examinations for entrance to college which follow it, is freely expressed. It was the discontent of the principals and teachers of certain high schools which led to the appointment of a committee to study the problem, as evidenced by the following letter:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

ENGLISH ROUND TABLE OF THE HIGH-SCHOOL SECTION

To Principals of High Schools and Teachers of English in High Schools:

At the meeting of the English Round Table of the National Education Association, in Boston, July 1, 1910, it was decided to appoint a committee to lay before the College-Entrance Examination Board the views of the high-school principals and teachers of the country in regard to the present entrance requirements in English and the examinations set upon them. The members of that committee so far appointed are: Charles Swain Thomas, head of the Department of English in the Newton (Mass.) High School; Benjamin A. Heydrick, head of the Department of English in the High School of Commerce in New York; Henry B. Dewey, state superintendent of schools, Olympia, Washington; Edwin L. Miller, assistant principal of the Central High School, Detroit, Michigan; Mrs. Henry Hulst, head of the Department of English in the Grand Rapids (Mich.) High School; Reuben Post Halleck, principal of the Male High School, Louisville, Kentucky; Miss Fannie W. McLean, head of the Department of English in the Berkeley (Cal.) High School; and James Fleming Hosc, head of the Department of English in the Chicago Teachers College.

The purpose of the committee is to learn from those best qualified to say, whether the present system of entrance requirements and examinations in English fosters the best sort of English work in the high school, and what changes, if any, should be urged upon the College-Entrance Examination Board through its subcommittee on English and its Board of Review. The

supreme consideration is to unite the teachers of the country in support of sound principles of secondary education, in order that boys and girls passing through high school may receive the kind of training in English best fitted to develop them and to prepare them for life.

To accomplish this purpose, it is necessary to enlist the sympathetic interest of supervisors, parents, and college examiners and instructors, as well as that of high-school teachers. It is proposed, therefore, that every association of teachers or parents in the country likely to be able to assist in reaching a consensus and decision on the questions at issue, be asked to appoint a co-operating committee, to gather evidence, direct discussion, and report conclusions to the committee of the Round Table, which shall compile and edit a final report. This central committee will report progress at the next annual meeting of the National Education Association, and hopes to complete the work within the following year.

The central committee, in order to get this work under way in a definite fashion, makes the following suggestions

TO CO-OPERATING COMMITTEES

Each co-operating committee should secure, as soon as possible, the judgment of its constituency upon the main question: *Do the college-entrance requirements in English, as at present administered, foster the best kind of English work in the high schools? If not, what changes should be made?* The results of correspondence, discussion, and conference should be formulated and placed in the hands of the central committee, together with a digest of the evidence upon which each conclusion is based.

The following questions, particularly those under 1, 2, and 3, should be carefully considered:

1. *The Influence of the Uniform College-Entrance Requirements in English upon the High School.*—

a) What is the influence of these requirements upon the high-school course in English? In what field is the influence most felt?

b) What is the influence of these requirements upon methods of teaching English in the high school?

c) What is the influence of these requirements upon the pupil's attitude toward his English work?

d) What changes, if any, would you make (1) in the high-school course in English and (2) in methods of teaching English in the high school if the problem of preparation for college were eliminated?

e) Do you offer the same courses to your college and your non-college group? Why or why not?

f) Are certain high schools affected in special ways by the entrance requirements or examinations of particular colleges? If so, specify.

2. *The High-School Course in English.*—

a) Is the following statement of the aims of the high-school course in English satisfactory? If not, how should it be modified?

"The aim of the high-school course in grammar and composition is to develop the power of the pupil to express the ideas that come to him from the whole range of his experience. The aim of the high-school course in literature is to develop in the pupil (1) a liking for good reading and (2) the power to understand and appreciate it."

b) What principles should be followed (1) in the selection of reading for the high-school course in literature and (2) in distributing the reading throughout the course? Should the list be (1) prescribed, (2) advisory, or (3) open? Do the Uniform Requirements include too many books? too few? sufficient variety of type? Should the distinction between *reading* and *study* be dropped? What provision should be made for the study of the history of literature?

3. *Entrance to College.*—

a) Would the following specifications provide a suitable test of efficiency in English upon graduation from high school and entrance to college?

(1) A test of the pupil's power of written expression by one or more compositions on subjects suggested by the personal experience or the general information of the candidate.

(2) A test of the range and quality of the reading of the pupil and of his power of literary appreciation by means of:

(a) The answering of a number of simple, suggestive questions on standard texts not previously prescribed.

(b) The explanation of two out of three or four passages of prose or poetry of ordinary difficulty, selected from books not previously prescribed.

(3) A test of the candidate's power of oral expression by reading aloud and by conversing.

b) Should a high-school diploma be given to a pupil whose deficiencies in English are such as to prevent his being recommended for admission to college?

c) Which is preferable, certification or uniform examination for entrance to college? Why? Is there a third method, better than either?

d) How should the National Conference on College-Entrance Requirements and Examinations be constituted?

4. *References.*—

What books or articles may be cited as expressing sound views (a) of the present situation with regard to high-school English? (b) of the high-school course in English and of methods of teaching English in the high school? (Give full library reference in each case.)

5. *Additional Questions.*—

What additional matter or matters do you wish to lay before the various co-operating committees throughout the country?

Faithfully yours,

CHICAGO TEACHERS COLLEGE

JAMES FLEMING HOSIC

April 25, 1911

Chairman of the Committee of the Round Table

The time intervening between the organization of the committee and the meeting of the Round Table at San Francisco, July 12, 1911, was too short to permit of collecting material for a report. The chairman made a statement of the plan of the committee and of the problem before it under the title "The Questions at Issue." This statement was in part as follows:

At the Boston meeting last year, the English Round Table authorized the appointment of a Committee on College-Entrance Requirements in English. The action was distinctly in the nature of a protest. The committee was instructed to tell the College-Entrance Examination Board what the high-school teachers of English want. This task may have appeared to the militant creators of the committee easy, if not grateful, but it did not appear so to the members of the committee themselves. For who knows precisely what the high-school teachers of English do want? Freedom from "college domination," certainly, but beyond that a positive, constructive program in harmony with the newer conceptions of education and successfully carried out by means of intelligent co-operation. Hence the committee decided that it must first of all ascertain what the teachers of English in the high schools really do want and why they want it. It was decided to organize a main committee to be composed of members from the various sections of the country, each of whom should seek to secure co-operating committees in the associations of English teachers in his territory. A bulletin was prepared stating the purpose and plan of the committee and outlining the questions upon which a consensus is desired. It is intended that each co-operating committee shall direct the discussion of these questions at a meeting of the local association, and after due consideration shall formulate a reply. Copies of the bulletin have been sent to most of the educational journals of the country. They have also been placed in the hands of many school officers and educational leaders, including school patrons. It has been suggested that we seek the opinions of the graduates of the schools themselves. This would certainly be desirable, but it would require more time and expense than we can command.

The questions which are included in the bulletin above referred to were phrased after much conference and much careful reading of recent educational literature. Representatives of both school and college have been very outspoken of late, and they have set forth their views on the questions which are now before us with definiteness and vigor. Many high-school principals and teachers declare that the influence of the entrance requirements in English is bad. They say that the legitimate aims and work of the high school are interfered with and that some method of entrance to college must be devised which will not only not hinder but positively help the high school in performing its task. Let us briefly review the controversy and attempt to define the issues more exactly.

The problem of the articulation of the high school with the college is a

natural result of our educational development. It has arisen from the overlapping of the older system of endowed colleges, with their self-developed preparatory schools, and the newer system of public high schools and universities, organized and supported by the state. The academy was not originally but soon became a preparatory school. The public high school, on the other hand, is intended to provide an increased opportunity of education for the children of the people. With the development of the state universities, it has come to be thought of as the necessary stepping-stone from the elementary school to the college of liberal arts, the college of science, or the professional and technical school. There has been a tendency on the part of the university to regard the public high school as mainly preparatory to itself, and the university sometimes makes excessive demands upon the high school. Since both are chiefly concerned with preparing citizens for effective service, the university can rightly ask only that the high school do well what it feels obliged to undertake. As a matter of fact, the state universities do at present accept for entrance credit practically all the courses which the high schools give.

It should be noted, also, that the state universities some years ago substituted a system of inspection and accrediting of schools for the older system of entrance examinations. By this plan, graduates of high schools of standard grade are admitted to the universities on a certificate signed by the principal. This arrangement has been generally accepted by the endowed colleges and universities, especially in the middle and western states, and seems to give much satisfaction. It has not, however, escaped criticism. We hear of "domination" of high schools by these higher institutions which accept certificates, and it is charged in some quarters that the system prevents the establishing of a high standard of scholarship in the colleges and universities. It has, at all events, brought about such cordial relations between the higher schools and the secondary schools that sympathetic co-operation in working out common problems is now general, and the necessity for freedom on the part of the high school to adjust itself to new demands seems to be clearly recognized.

Meanwhile, many of the children of the people have been making use of the public high school as their place of preparation for our older endowed colleges and universities, and "thereby hangs a tale." For these colleges were organized to give a certain type of education, and they still regard themselves as having functions distinctly different from those of the colleges supported by the state. They have been exceedingly conservative in maintaining the traditional view as to what constitutes a higher or liberal education and have felt justified in demanding that any person who may seek to take their courses shall have prepared himself in a particular way, so that he may exactly fit into their scheme and continue his studies with a proper appreciation of them. True, most of these institutions have an elective system, but, nevertheless, the undergraduate work is so planned as practically to determine what the student's preparatory course must be. Now since it is both undesirable and impracticable to give in the high school two sets of courses, one for

those who wish to go to college and one for those who do not, it comes about that the presence of a few pupils preparing for college largely determines what course all shall pursue. Indeed, the effect is often so marked as to transform the last year into a year of review and preparation for examinations, frequently the particular examinations set by certain colleges differing widely among themselves. For the high-school teacher, a graduate of one of these colleges, takes a natural pride in the number of his pupils who pass entrance examinations creditably, and he gets into the habit of measuring his success as a teacher by this standard. In this way, as many think, the high school is turned aside from its legitimate uses.

The problem of articulation is complicated by the fact that many colleges which admit by examination do not utilize the College-Entrance Examination Board, but set up instead special requirements. Some states, moreover, have very definite systems of high-school supervision and prescribe courses and set examinations for the high-school diploma. In many cases pupils about to leave high school have their minds centered upon the coming examinations. The inevitable tendency of such a situation is to transform a high school into a cram school. Teachers do not teach, they prepare for examination. Pupils do not study to learn but to pass tests. Such a condition is intolerable. It is opposed to good sense and constitutes a breach of faith with the public which supports the schools. The individual school is robbed of its freedom, the teacher of initiative, and the pupils of true educational influence.

Various solutions of the problem are urged. Many think the difficulty would be removed if the colleges would examine schools instead of pupils. The essence of this plan is supervision of the high schools by the universities. A standard high-school course is arranged, specific requirements in the various subjects are made out, definite units of credit are assigned, the various high schools are rated, or, as it is called, accredited, and an inspector is appointed to visit the high schools from time to time and ascertain whether the equipment, course of study, and teaching staff are adequate and actually turning out good work. The inspector offers advice and encouragement, points out weak spots, and, in general, assists the schools in standardizing themselves. Not all boys and girls, however, can be made efficient even by the best high school, and, consequently, the colleges which accept students on certificate must and do receive many who are ill-prepared for any sort of college work. The result would seem inevitably to be a lowering of the tone of the college and a depreciation in its standards. At any rate, the point is urged with some warmth by the colleges which cling to the entrance examination.

The fact is that we have many colleges supported by private means which were never intended to educate the children of all the people. They were founded more or less in accordance with the English ideal, and their aims have been intellectual culture and preparation for the speaking and reading professions. These colleges say that they have a right to choose what sort of education they will offer and, therefore, what sort of preparation for their work they

will demand. We want, say these colleges, only the pick of the high-school graduates, and we do not regard the newer high-school subjects, commercial and vocational work particularly, as well fitted to develop intellectual culture; and, therefore, we wish those who come to us to have studied languages, mathematics, science, and history. Their position is, of course, the traditional one and the burden of proof lies on the advocates of the new.

So long as the older colleges got all the students they wanted, they felt their position to be secure, but with the rise of state-supported colleges has come a competition that must be met. The older institutions find themselves at the parting of the ways. Either they must be small and select or they must articulate freely with the high schools. Some are content to be small and select; others are willing to reform. Harvard has recently arranged a new system of entrance. The University of Chicago has just announced a still more liberal plan, and beyond doubt others will follow.

In view of these advance steps on the part of the greatest of the endowed universities, it requires no prophet to foretell the coming of entire freedom to the high schools to work out their own destiny. Liberty is at hand, what shall we do with it? The mere liberalizing or removal of the entrance requirements will certainly not solve all the problems of high-school English. Was it not mainly the uncertainties and vagaries of the high schools themselves which made an attempt at uniform requirements necessary? And have not the colleges justly complained that an appeal to the high schools for help in framing their requirements, raised such a discord of voices that the colleges were obliged to decide for themselves what was best to do? In fact, do we not owe it to the colleges that we have a high-school course in English at all? The high schools do not even yet know their own minds in this matter. Only here and there do you find a high school in which a thoroly practical, consistent, progressive course in English is carried out with an eye single to the individual and social life of the boys and girls. There is altogether too much consciousness of the college lecture-room, past and future, altogether too much high-flown criticism, pedantic reference-hunting, and attempt at literary composition. Our exercises have been too isolated, too motiveless, and too formal. We have failed to teach the simple, correct English, particularly the spoken English, of everyday life.

It is to be hoped that when the work of the committee is complete and the experience of the various sections of the country is brought together and made available for all of us, that there will appear some definite lines of progress upon which we may move out. Nothing can be of more importance to our pupils than that they secure a perfect mastery of the mother-tongue, and the task of discovering how to give it to them is our task, the task of the English teachers of America.

THE CONSENSUS SO FAR OBTAINED

The committee has received replies to some or all of its questions from over seven hundred persons, acting either as individuals or

collectively. The 225 teachers of English in the high schools of New York City, for example, sent a unanimous report condemning the present requirements and examinations. The English section of the State Teachers Association of Illinois, and the associations in Nevada took similar action. As nearly as can be determined, these persons are identified as follows; high-school teachers, 694; normal-school teachers, 13; teachers of English or of education in the colleges, 20; principals and superintendents in towns and cities, 44; state inspectors and state superintendents of public instruction, 13. The distribution is as follows: New England, 35; Middle States, 282; South, 31; North Central, 295; West, 42. Both larger and smaller public high schools are represented, but, unfortunately, few private schools have been heard from. It is certainly desirable that their views should be known.

As usual, the answers to the questions sent out by the committee fall into three classes, radical, moderate, and conservative. All sections of the country are about equally represented in each class, but the conservatives are greatly outnumbered. Comparatively few say that they consider the influence of the Uniform Requirements entirely helpful. Many are grateful for the emphasis upon English work which the colleges have helped to establish, but most feel that it is time to go forward. With increasing knowledge of the nature of the pupils and of the character of the results actually obtained, the high schools themselves must work out progressive courses in English, wisely adapted to varying needs.

Representative opinions concerning the influence of the requirements upon the course are as follows: "have good influence" (seven schools); "unify the course" (five schools); "give definiteness" (four schools); "set a high standard" (four schools); "determine the course" (six schools—nearly all assume that they do); "force use of unsuitable material, hamper, restrict" (fifty-two schools); "emphasize the unessential," "deadening," "pernicious," "call for memory instead of thinking" (several others). As to the influence upon methods of teaching, about one-fourth of the answers are favorable: "more systematic and thorough," "guide inexperienced teachers," "establish uniformity," "co-ordinate literature and composition" are among the phrases used. Several say that methods are not influenced at all; the large majority find something to deplore. "The requirements prevent freedom and individuality," "hinder adapting the work to the pupils," "cause mechanical work," "overemphasize analysis and collecting of facts at the expense of appreciation and of ethical appeal," "institute cramming for examination, college methods, technical study." It seems evident that a large

number of teachers feel the Uniform Requirements to be, for one reason or another, a positive hindrance to effective teaching. As to the influence on the pupils, a respectable minority find it wholesome: "Importance is lent to the work," "the compositions are better," "the reading is better." A few think the influence is confined to the fourth year of the course. A large number can detect no influence, while very many discover "dislike," "indifference," "wrong conception of literature as a mere task," "looking only to getting to college," and "loss of interest on the part of the non-college group." Some complain that the pupils are overburdened, and a number say that the influence of the requirements depends upon the attitude of the teacher.

Six high schools would make no change in the English course if the college requirements were eliminated; they are satisfied with them. One says, "no change for *Western* colleges." Several declare that they pay no attention to the requirements. Inspection of their courses shows, however, that they do use most of the books on the list. The main body come out strongly for reform. They urge more composition, especially oral composition, more use of subjects from the life experiences of the pupils in place of those from books, more emphasis on "fundamentals." The literature course, they say, should be more flexible, better adapted to the needs, interests, and capacities of boys and girls; more modern books should be read; the work should aim at appreciation, not at information and technical analysis in preparation for an examination; the work of the last two years is too abstruse and too exacting; American literature is neglected; there is no progress from year to year. The earnestness of these protests is unmistakable. A large number of the writers feel and feel deeply the unwisdom of sacrificing the possibilities of growth in taste and in character on the part of boys and girls for the convenience of college examiners, or a mistaken pride in turning out successful candidates. It is difficult to see how tradition, no matter how strongly intrenched, can stand long in the way of reorganization.

Most schools make no distinction between those who are going to college and those who are not, but give the same training in English to all. A few provide special drills in the fourth year to meet college demands, and several schools offer special courses in preparation for business. Very few complain of the influence of a particular college, though it is evident from the answers that certain higher institutions in various parts of the country do exert a powerful influence on the schools near them.

The aim of the high-school course, as stated in the circular, was pronounced satisfactory by nearly all. A few would add such words as clearly, easily, and effectively after "express" in the statement concerning grammar and composition, and a much larger number would include "ethical training," "enlarge the view of life," "raise standards of conduct," and similar purposes in the aim of literature.

The answers as to the selection and distribution of literature are exceedingly difficult to summarize. There is no agreement here, and it is evident that the Uniform Requirements have not thrown much light on the problem. The principle most frequently suggested is that the literature should be adapted to the interests and capacities of the pupils and should grow more difficult as he advances. Others would "include a variety of types," "illustrate the development of English literature," "choose representative authors," "illustrate the forms of discourse," "correlate with composition," "cause world classics to be read in school and modern authors outside," "assign certain books for study and others for home reading," "both satisfy tastes and create them." Some would teach American literature in the first two years and English literature in the last two. Others say, "from the objective to the subjective," "story first and subtler poetry and essays last," "follow chronological order," "include a variety of form according to maturity in each year," etc. No doubt there should be considerable flexibility of choice and arrangement, but it is hard to escape the conviction that the high-school course in literature presents an educational question that has not received adequate study from anybody.

There is great difference of opinion also as to the lists. The conservative minority wish them prescribed or partly prescribed and partly advisory. A few suggest the prescription of types. Many choose open lists or no lists at all. But by far the larger number declare for advisory lists arranged by some authoritative body. Almost no one seems to think the present list entirely satisfactory, the principal objection being that the books are not sufficiently varied to meet the needs of all classes. It is urged by some that more modern short stories and more selections by American authors be included. Several find Milton too remote from the interests of their classes. Few definite suggestions are made, however, and it seems evident that little experimental work has been done to determine what books are best suited to high-school pupils.

The majority would retain the distinction between *reading* and *study*, though it is clear that the question was not understood to refer to the application of these terms which is made by the Uniform Confer-

ence. To require both class study and rapid outside reading throughout the four years is apparently the rule. The vote means, then, that most would have both intensive and extensive reading. It may fairly be inferred from the other answers that the majority are opposed to the setting apart of a few books to be studied in the fourth year in preparation for a college examination.

Nearly all would make provision for the history of literature, but, as already indicated, there is lack of agreement as to what the provision should be. The following suggestions are made: "talks"; "a light requirement"; "a comprehensive glance somewhere in the course"; "distribute through the four years"; "a separate elective course"; "with a textbook in a definite course"; "in the second year"; "in the fourth year"; "by periods as a setting for the authors"; "a text with reading of selections"; "in the history course"; "subordinate to the classics." Here is another educational problem for solution.

The test for entrance to college suggested in the circular met with strong approval, except as to "conversing." Several feel that the pupil would be too much embarrassed to do himself justice. A very few prefer examination on prescribed books, and others suggest partial certification. But the overwhelming majority prefer certification to any sort of examination for entrance to college, for the reason that examinations do not examine and that the effect of them upon the schools is bad. With the best intentions in the world, college professors are unable to set examinations adapted to high-school boys and girls, and so long as there are examinations to be passed so long pupils will be coached to pass them, to the infinite detriment of natural, healthy interest in the subject for its own sake.

Many would, under certain conditions, give a high-school diploma to a pupil they would not recommend to college. They propose, however, various methods of guarding the practice, and they would treat such cases as exceptional.

The National Conference on English Requirements should be made up of college and high-school representatives in equal number, say most of the writers. A few add "from all localities." Several declare boldly that the high schools should be free to determine their own courses, and one or two suggest the advisability of including teachers of subjects other than English.

Two additional topics of great importance were brought forward. The first is that of co-operation among all the teachers of a school in securing good English. The other is that of the organization of the

elementary course in English and the high-school course in English into one unified, coherent whole. These are subjects to be pressed upon the attention of the National Council of Teachers of English, however, rather than upon that of the National Conference on Uniform Requirements.

A few letters from well-known students of current educational problems will serve to supplement the principal facts set forth above.

Two professors of education write:

"I believe that college-entrance requirements in English are having a very definite influence upon the high-school work. The State University requirements in English have entirely remodeled the curriculum of high-school English in this state during the last ten years. I think that as much has been accomplished as is possible by merely stating years and books. The next step that our colleges and normal schools must take is to indicate in much more detail the method of carrying on the work. Many teachers are trying to follow the entrance requirements but are doing it in a mechanical fashion. As a result, many of our boys and girls finish the high school with a repugnance for reading good literature, and with utter inability to write decent English. I receive about two hundred new students each year in my department, and I find many of them very poorly equipped for writing their everyday ideas, and for expressing the ideas with which they deal in my own subject. I presume that they could define figures of speech, write rules for capitalization and punctuation, but when it comes to expressing their ideas in clear terse English many of them utterly fail. They also fail in punctuation.

"The failure of pupils to gain a love for good literature is due in a large measure to the lack of adaptation of the reading matter to the ages and individual aptitude of the different pupils. Most of the English work is in the hands of women, who frequently, very usually, do not understand boy nature. I have one boy in the high school who is deeply interested in mechanics, out-of-door sports, and woodcraft. He draws from our city library and the university library scores of books every year upon those subjects. His teacher of English, a woman, keeps him after school frequently to learn stereotyped definitions of words and figures of speech, and to urge him to learn the traditional literature properly. If she could only meet the boy upon his own footing, she would have no difficulty in enlisting his interest and in securing satisfactory results.

"Similar difficulties arise in the composition work. Most of the composition exercises are ill-adapted to the interests and capacities of the children. They are given all sorts of formal composition exercises in which they have little interest, but they are allowed to make slipshod statements in their everyday expressions, and little attention is given to the composition in the history class, the mathematics class, or the physics class. Why could the composition work not be more closely related to the other subjects? Tons of effort are expended by teachers in trying to make pupils into short-story writers

and authors. Much less time and energy spent in helping them to express themselves simply yet accurately on everyday matters would be much more effective."

"I am convinced that the teaching of grammar, rhetoric, and composition in the high school is too formal; it consists too much in the learning of definitions, rules, and formulae, with illustrations more or less remote from the pupil's interests and everyday expression. The purpose which many instructors seem to keep in mind is to have the pupil acquire a theoretical knowledge in these fields, rather than to have him gain facility in the employment of effective modes of expression. It seems to me that the pupil is required to learn conventional matters rather than to acquire a feeling for the best forms in current usage. The work of the school is too far removed from the actual linguistic needs of everyday life. This results in alienating the affections of many pupils for all work in grammar, rhetoric, and composition. It is probable that the majority of pupils would vote that these were the most distasteful subjects in the whole high-school course.

"I do not think that the requirements in English for entrance to college work are entirely responsible for the formal character of instruction in the high school. Undoubtedly they have put a premium upon mere verbal learning, though I believe there is much less emphasis upon that sort of thing now than there was a few years ago. But even if the colleges would accept anything which the high schools would present, it is probable that the work would still be more or less formal and remote, until instructors gain the view that the object of these branches is not to acquire theoretical knowledge so much as to gain facility in the use of modes of expression that are appropriate to the everyday needs of the pupil. If instructors would be governed by this latter conception, their work would be based less upon formal textbooks than is now the case in most places.

"In respect to the teaching of literature I am convinced there is too great formalism here also. According to my observation, pupils are still required to memorize what some analyst or critic says about the character and values of the English classics. It is undoubtedly worth while for high-school students to analyze English masterpieces; but it seems to me to be worthless to memorize what other people say about the qualities of any work or selection which is written. It is probable that if pupils were not examined upon these formal matters, instructors would not feel the necessity of insisting upon them in their teaching."

From the principal of one of the best of the Eastern high schools:

"It seems to me that so far as examinations are required by the colleges they should be examinations for power rather than for definite information. I think that the specific nature of college-entrance examinations has greatly

hampered the English work in the high school. Instead of testing the pupils as to their ability to read, to write, and to speak good English, the college examinations have emphasized the candidates' information concerning a large number of things that are not essential. They have specified exactly what literature was to be read, and designated so closely just what was to be done with this literature that all individuality has been ground out of the teachers.

"If I felt that we could trust the colleges to handle the matter in a common-sense way, I should say that it would be well for them to require an examination testing the pupils' ability to read and interpret English of the grade, say, of Macaulay's Essays, or of Tennyson's Idylls, or of the less difficult plays of Shakespeare; that they should require the pupil to be able to write an account of his own experiences in straightforward, idiomatic English, practically free from rhetorical and grammatical errors, and that he should be able to carry on an intelligent conversation on the topics of the day without exposing any ridiculous defects in his speech, either in construction or in expression. The colleges, however, are so largely manned by young Ph.D.'s who have taken their degrees on such subjects as the rhythmic recurrence of "or" in Shakespeare's plays of the middle period, that I fear we shall not get any large educational treatment of our pupils from them.

"Personally, I think the time is not far distant when the colleges will take graduates from a four years' high-school course on the recommendation of the principal. I should much rather trust the high-school principals than the colleges in these matters, for it will be some time before the colleges get away from the idea that an education means a certain quantum of information in the hierarchy of subjects."

The superintendent of public instruction in an Eastern state:

"I have often wondered, whether it would be desirable to give separate consideration to the teaching of English as expression and the teaching of English for appreciation—in other words, composition and literature, including under the first oral expression. I have a conviction that the greatest source of confusion in English teaching at the present time is the attempt to teach largely by the same methods these two different types of work, which, in my estimation, rest on essentially different pedagogical necessities. I would even go so far as to say, as a result of observation, that in the ordinary secondary school and college, separate teachers should, wherever possible, be had for literature on the one hand, considered mainly from the standpoint of appreciation, and formal English, meaning thereby largely expression and analytical study of some literary products, on the other."

From neighboring colleges, also in the East:

"Constant agitation of changes in the English entrance requirements tends to cause uncertainty to preparatory school teachers. The new requirements set by the conference of 1909 have not yet gone into effect. Until they receive

a fair test it seems inadvisable to reopen the entire subject. The new requirements seem to us sufficiently flexible to meet the demands of teachers for variety.

"The oral test suggested in 3a (3) is impracticable with us, owing to the very large number of candidates examined. To the following question, whether a high-school diploma should be given to a pupil whose deficiencies in English are such as to prevent his being recommended for admission to college, we should answer decidedly, No. We prefer entrance examinations to certification because they seem to us to afford more convincing proof as to the candidate's ability. The recommendation of the preparatory-school teachers may be helpful as collateral evidence, but we think a man should be able to meet such college tests as we give. We have for some time been setting some topics of a general nature for composition."

"The college-entrance requirements in English, as at present administered, do not foster the best kind of English work in the high schools.

"1. a) They limit the high-school course to readings which may be good for one school, and may be bad for another school with different problems.

"b) They inevitably oblige most of the high-school teachers to prepare pupils for examination, rather than to give them the best training. When the uniform entrance requirements were first proposed, nobody expected this result.

"c) I believe that most pupils write literary appreciations which they think will be acceptable, rather than their own opinion of the books read.

"d) In my judgment the high-school course in English should include English grammar, practical composition work, the history of English literature, and a considerable amount of reading. One of the chief evils of the present system seems to me to be that practically every book put into the hands of the pupil is a textbook. When I first read *Pilgrim's Progress*, I read it as a book, not as a school text, with annotations and questions. I feel sure that the reduction of every piece of English literature which is put into the hands of a high-school pupil to a school text is decidedly injurious to an appreciation of literature.

"The methods should be left to the school. Results are all that the colleges ask.

"2. a) 'The whole range of his experience' seems to me unsatisfactory. I remember well that, at the age of sixteen, I had very little experience. I should, nevertheless, have resented certain subjects for composition which I have seen proposed. No boy should be compelled to put on paper his private and personal feelings.

"I have no objection to (1) and (2), though I believe that ability to write is the first requisite.

"b) In my opinion, uniform requirements are an absurdity. For examination purposes, the distinction between reading and study should be dropped.

I believe that, in teaching literature, some books or essays should be exhaustively studied, and others read for general effect.

"Some elementary history of English literature ought to be thoroughly mastered. High-school graduates should know the names of our great writers and the names of their principal works.

"3. A good composition and a statement of reading done would satisfy me, as an entrance requirement. I do not believe that literary 'appreciation' is a proper test. Under the conditions of admission examinations, I do not think that oral tests are fair to the pupils. Nervousness might debar many."

CONCLUSION

It is clear that there is little or no difference of opinion on some of the points involved in the investigation. The lists of books which are published from time to time by the National Conference practically determine the choice of classics for the high-school course. The use of them varies. The nearer the school to an examining College the more rigidly the teachers adhere to the list and the more technical and detailed is the study required. Schools which send graduates mainly to accrediting institutions, on the other hand, frequently regard the lists as merely suggestive and seem to feel free to choose books and adapt teaching to the class in hand. It is the examination, and particularly the kind of examination set, which is objected to by the schools. Many teachers declare a preference for examination as opposed to certification for college entrance, but they almost invariably stipulate that the examination shall be more liberal than at present. It is evident, also, that the emphasis upon literature in the reports of the Conference has circumscribed the composition work of the schools. Many teachers feel that, at present, literary composition receives proportionally too much attention and that the forms of expression in use in daily life, particularly the oral forms, are being neglected. This is due, in part, to the demand for more or less exact knowledge of the form and content of the books prescribed and, in part, to the failure of school authorities to provide adequately, either in teachers or in equipment, for the teaching of composition. It may be necessary to separate the course in composition from the course in literature, as several have suggested, in order to bring about needed reforms.

It was the intention of those who created the Committee on Entrance Requirements that a report of its findings should be laid before the National Conference at the earliest opportunity. The Conference, on its part, has invited the committee to send representatives to the meeting of February 22 to present the facts obtained. This will be done. It

has seemed proper, however, to publish a summary of the replies to the circular letter in order that all may know what progress has been made and also that the consensus may become much more complete. If all who see this article will send a statement of their views to the committee at once and will induce others to do so, the final report can be made what it ought to be—an authoritative document on the subject. It is hoped that a report signed by all members of the committee can be presented to the Round Table for its approval at the meeting of the National Education Association in July, and afterward published for general distribution. For whatever errors there may be in the present summary, the chairman alone is responsible.

For the convenience of those who may wish to consider the subject, the latest report of the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English is here appended, together with a short list of references.

The Conference voted that the following requirement for the years 1913, 1914, and 1915 should be recommended to the constituent bodies for adoption.

Preparation in English has two main objects: (1) command of correct and clear English, spoken and written; (2) ability to read with accuracy, intelligence, and appreciation.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND COMPOSITION

The first object requires instruction in grammar and composition. English grammar should ordinarily be reviewed in the secondary school; and correct spelling and grammatical accuracy should be rigorously exacted in connection with all written work during the four years. The principles of English composition governing punctuation, the use of words, paragraphs, and the different kinds of whole composition, including letter-writing, should be thoroughly mastered; and practice in composition, oral as well as written, should extend throughout the secondary-school period. Written exercises may well comprise narration, description, and easy exposition and argument based upon simple outlines. It is advisable that subjects for this work be taken from the student's personal experience, general knowledge, and studies other than English, as well as from his reading in literature. Finally, special instruction in language and composition should be accompanied by concerted effort of teachers in all branches to cultivate in the student the habit of using good English in his recitations and various exercises, whether oral or written.

LITERATURE

The second object is sought by means of two lists of books, headed respectively *reading* and *study*, from which may be framed a progressive course in literature covering four years. In connection with both lists, the student

should be trained in reading aloud and be encouraged to commit to memory some of the more notable passages both in verse and in prose. As an aid to literary appreciation, he is further advised to acquaint himself with the most important facts in the lives of the authors whose works he reads and with their place in literary history.

a) *Reading*.—The aim of this course is to foster in the student the habit of intelligent reading and to develop a taste for good literature, by giving him a first-hand knowledge of some of its best specimens. He should read the books carefully, but his attention should not be so fixed upon details that he fails to appreciate the main purpose and charm of what he reads.

With a view to large freedom of choice, the books provided for reading are arranged in the following groups, from which at least ten units¹ are to be selected, two from each group:

I. The Old Testament, comprising at least the chief narrative passages in Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Daniel, together with the books of Ruth and Esther; the *Odyssey*, with the omission, if desired, of Books I, II, III, IV, V, XV, XVI, XVII; the *Iliad*, with the omission, if desired, of Books XI, XIII, XIV, XV, XVII, XXI; Virgil's *Aeneid*. The *Odyssey*, *Iliad*, and *Aeneid* should be read in English translations of recognized literary excellence.

For any unit of this group a unit from any other group may be substituted.

II. Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*; *Midsummer Night's Dream*; *As You Like It*; *Twelfth Night*; *Henry the Fifth*; *Julius Caesar*.

III. Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, Part I; Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield*; either Scott's *Ivanhoe*, or Scott's *Quentin Durward*; Hawthorne's *House of Seven Gables*; either Dickens' *David Copperfield*, or Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities*; Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*; Mrs. Gaskell's *Cranford*; George Eliot's *Silas Marner*; Stevenson's *Treasure Island*.

IV. Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Part I; The "Sir Roger de Coverley Papers" in the *Spectator*; Franklin's *Autobiography* (condensed); Irving's *Sketch Book*; Macaulay's *Essays on Lord Clive and Warren Hastings*; Thackerays' *English Humorists*; *Selections* from Lincoln, including at least the two Inaugurals, the Speeches in Independence Hall and at Gettysburg, the Last Public Address, and Letter to Horace Greeley, along with a brief memoir or estimate; Parkman's *Oregon Trail*; either Thoreau's *Walden*, or Huxley's *Autobiography* and selections from *Lay Sermons*, including the addresses on "Improving Natural Knowledge," "A Liberal Education," and "A Piece of Chalk"; Stevenson's *Inland Voyage and Travels with a Donkey*.

V. Palgrave's *Golden Treasury* (first series), Books II and III, with especial attention to Dryden, Collins, Gray, Cowper, and Burns; Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard" and Goldsmith's *Deserted Village*; Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner* and Lowell's *Vision of Sir Launfal*; Scott's *Lady of the Lake*; Byron's

¹ Each unit is set off by semicolons.

Childe Harold, Canto IV, and *Prisoner of Chillon*; Palgrave's *Golden Treasury* (first series), Book IV, with especial attention to Wordsworth, Keats, and Shelley; Poe's "Raven," Longfellow's *Courtship of Miles Standish*, and Whittier's *Snow-Bound*; Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome* and Arnold's *Sohrab and Rustum*; Tennyson's *Gareth and Lynette*, *Lancelot and Elaine*, and *The Passing of Arthur*; Browning's "Cavalier Tunes," "The Lost Leader," "How They Brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix," "Home Thoughts from Abroad," "Home Thoughts from the Sea," "Incident of the French Camp," "Hervé Riel," "Pheidippides," "My Last Duchess," "Up at a Villa—Down in the City."

b) *Study*.—This part of the requirement is intended as a natural and logical continuation of the student's earlier reading, with greater stress laid upon form and style, the exact meaning of words and phrases, and the understanding of allusions. For this close reading are provided a play, a group of poems, an oration, and an essay, as follows:

Shakespeare's *Macbeth*; Milton's *L'Allegro*, *Il Penseroso*, and *Comus*; either Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America*, or both Washington's *Farewell Address* and Webster's *First Bunker Hill Oration*; either Macaulay's *Life of Johnson*, or Carlyle's *Essay on Burns*.

EXAMINATION

However accurate in subject-matter, no paper will be considered satisfactory if seriously defective in punctuation, spelling, or other essentials of good usage.

The examination will be divided into two parts, one of which may be taken as a preliminary, and the other as a final.

The first part of the examination will be upon ten units chosen, in accordance with the plan described earlier, from the lists headed *reading*; and it may include also questions upon grammar and the simpler principles of rhetoric, and a short composition upon some topic drawn from the student's general knowledge or experience. On the books prescribed for reading, the form of the examination will usually be the writing of short paragraphs on several topics which the candidate may choose out of a considerable number. These topics will involve such knowledge and appreciation of plot, character-development, and other qualities of style and treatment as may be fairly expected of boys and girls. In grammar and rhetoric, the candidate may be asked specific questions upon the practical essentials of these studies, such as the relation of the various parts of a sentence to one another, the construction of individual words in a sentence of reasonable difficulty, and those good usages of modern English which one should know in distinction from current errors.

The second part of the examination will include composition and those books comprised in the list headed *study*. The test in composition will consist of one or more essays, developing a theme through several paragraphs;

the subjects will be drawn from the books prescribed for *study*, from the candidate's other studies, and from his personal knowledge and experiences quite apart from reading. For this purpose the examiner will provide several subjects, perhaps five or six, from which the candidate may make his own selections. The test on the books prescribed for study will consist of questions upon their content, form, and structure, and upon the meaning of such words, phrases, and allusions as may be necessary to an understanding of the works and appreciation of their salient qualities of style. General questions may also be asked concerning the lives of the authors, their other works, and the periods of literary history to which they belong.

SELECTED REFERENCES¹

- ABBOTT, ALLAN. English in Secondary Schools: A Review. *Sch. Rev.*, June, 1901.
- ANGELL, JAMES R. New Requirements for Entrance and Graduation at the University of Chicago. *Science*, June 23, 1911.
- Articulation of High School and College. A pamphlet containing representative opinions collected by the high-school teachers of New York City.
- BALLIETT, THOMAS M. Influence of Present Methods of Graduate Instruction on the Teaching in Secondary Schools. *Sch. Rev.*, April, 1908.
- BOLTON, FREDERICK E. College Domination and the Accredited System. *Sch. Rev.*, September, 1909.
- . The Preparation of High-School Teachers. *Sch. Rev.*, February, 1907.
- BOURNE, RANDOLPH S. The College: An Undergraduate View. *Atlantic*, November, 1911.
- BRONSON, CARLETON L. Relations between Colleges and Secondary Schools. *Sch. Rev.*, October, 1910.
- BROOKS, STRATTON D. Relations of the University to the Secondary School. *Proc. N.E.A.*, 1909.
- BROWN, ELMER E. Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1910, Vol. I, pp. 15-24. Also bibliography, pp. 29-32.
- BROWN, EMILY F. The Unification of College-Entrance Requirements. *Ed. Bi.*, October, 1907.
- BROWN, J. F. *The American High School*, Macmillan, 1910.
- BUCHNER, EDWARD F. The Relation of the High School to the College. *Ed.*, June, 1906.
- BUTLER, NICHOLAS M. A New Method of Admission to College. *Ed. Rev.*, September, 1909.

¹ The following abbreviations are used: *Ed.* (*Education*); *Ed. Bi.* (*Educational Bi-monthly*); *Ed. Rev.* (*Educational Review*); *Eng. Jour.* (*English Journal*); *Proc. N.E.A.* (*Proceedings of the National Education Association*); *Sch. Rev.* (*School Review*).

- CARPENTER, GEORGE R. College-Entrance Requirements in English. In *Teaching of English*, pp. 283-92.
- CARY, C. P. The Opportunities of the Modern High School. *Proc. N.E.A.*, 1910, p. 457.
- CHUBB, PERCIVAL. The Menace of Pedantry in the Teaching of English. *Sch. Rev.*, January, 1912.
- COLBY, J. ROSE. English in the School. *Ed. Bi.*, October, 1908.
- College-Entrance Requirements. Report of Committee of National Education Association, 1899.
- Committee of Ten, Report of. American Book Co., 1893.
- COOK, ALBERT S. Summary of the Proceedings of the Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English, 1894-99.
- COULTER, JOHN M. What the University Expects of the Secondary School. *Sch. Rev.*, February, 1909.
- CRANDALL, HARRIETT. Thoughts on the Present Discontent. *Ed. Bi.*, October, 1908.
- CROSS, WILBUR L. English in the Schools. *Ed.*, May, 1908.
- CROWE, JOHN M. Report of Conference Committee on High-School English. *Sch. Rev.*, February, 1909.
- DAVIS, NATHANIEL F. Is the Present Mode of Granting Certificate Rights to Preparatory Schools Satisfactory? *Sch. Rev.*, February, 1907.
- DEGARMO, CHARLES. Scientific Basis of High-School Methods. *Sch. Rev.*, September, 1908.
- . *Principles of Secondary Education—The Studies*. Macmillan, 1907.
- ERSKINE, JOHN. English in the College Course. *Ed. Rev.*, November, 1910.
- FARRAND, WILSON. College-Entrance Requirements: Are They Excessive? *Sch. Rev.*, January, 1908.
- . The Existing Relations between School and College. *Ed. Rev.*, February, 1903.
- FLEXNER, ABRAHAM. *The American College*. Century Co., 1908.
- GARDINER, J. H. Teaching English in the Schools. (See Lewis, W. D.) *Outlook*, March 19, 1910.
- . Training in Illiteracy. *Sch. Rev.*, November, 1909.
- GREENOUGH, C. N. The College-Entrance Requirements in English: A Census of the Opinions of Six Hundred Freshmen. Leaflet No. 84 of the New England Association of Teachers of English.
- GREENOUGH, C. N., HERSEY, F. W. C., AND NUTTER, C. R. *Report on the Examinations for Admission to Harvard College*. January, 1906.
- HALLECK, REUBEN POST. Professional Preparation of High-School Teachers. *Sch. Rev.*, September, 1907.
- HEYDRICK, B. A. The Relation of the College-Entrance Requirements to the High-School Course in English. *Proc. of New York Assoc. of Teachers of English*, May 15, 1909.

- HOLMES, W. H. How the College-Entrance Certificate Board Can Help the High School. *Ed.*, May, 1911.
- HOOPER, CYRUS LAURON. Existing Conditions in the Teaching of English. *Sch. Rev.*, April, 1907.
- HOPKINS, EDWIN M. Can Good Work in Teaching Composition Be Done under Present Conditions? *Eng. Jour.*, January, 1912.
- JUDD, CHARLES H. Reasons for Modifying Entrance Requirements. *Ed.*, January, 1912.
- KINGSLEY, CLARENCE D. Report of the Committee of Nine on the Articulation of High School and College, National Education Association at San Francisco, July, 1911.
- LEWIS, W. D. The Aim of the High-School Course in English. *Eng. Jour.*, January, 1912.
- . College Domination of High Schools. *Outlook*, December 11, 1909. (See reply to Gardiner, *Outlook* for March 19, 1910.)
- MCANDREW, WILLIAM A. College Influence on Public High Schools. *School Bulletin*, January, 1910.
- . The High School Itself. *Proc. N.E.A.*, 1910, p. 450
- MOORE, CLIFFORD H. A New Plan of Admission to Harvard. *Ed. Rev.*, June, 1911.
- National Council of Teachers of English, Proceedings of. *Eng. Jour.*, January, 1912.
- NEILSON, W. A. What the College Has a Right to Expect of the Schools in English. *Sch. Rev.*, February, 1908.
- New England Association of Teachers of English. Report of the Standing Committee on Entrance Requirements. H. G. PEARSON, chairman. *Sch. Rev.*, December, 1908.
- Open Letter. New York Teachers of English. EDWIN FAIRLEY, Jamaica High School, Secretary.
- OWEN, WM. B. Reforms in the Curriculum of the Secondary School. *Sch. Rev.*, XVI, 265. Signs of Unrest; the Problem of Problems. *Sch. Rev.*, XVII, 272, 718. The Way Out; What the Colleges Can Do. *Sch. Rev.*, XVIII, 45, 277, 353.
- Pedagogy, Report of the Committee on; Leaflet No. 7 of the Association of High-school Teachers of English of New York City.
- PRITCHETT, HENRY S. Relations of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Part II of Report of Carnegie Foundation for 1910.
- REED, EDWIN T. The High-School Course in English. *The Bulletin*, Moorhead (Minn.) State Normal School, March, 1908.
- RUSSELL, JAMES E. The Educational Value of Examinations for Admission to College. *Sch. Rev.*, January, 1903.
- SCOTT, FRED N. College-Entrance Requirements in English. *Sch. Rev.*, June, 1901.

- SCOTT, FRED N. What the West Wants in Preparatory English. *Sch. Rev.*, September, 1909.
- Seventeen, Committee of. Joint Recommendation on Preparation of High-School Teachers. *Proc. N.E.A.*, 1907, p. 521.
- SMITH, JESSIE. English Secondary Schools. *Ed. Rev.*, November, 1910.
- SNEDDEN, DAVID. The Achievements and Shortcomings of the American College. *Sch. Rev.*, June, 1910.
- Syllabus for Secondary Schools—English.* New York State Department, Albany, 1910.
- TANNER, GEORGE W. Teaching of English in the High Schools of the Middle West. *Sch. Rev.*, January, 1907.
- THOMAS, CHARLES S. Essential Principles in Teaching English. *Ed.*, October, 1910.
- THURBER, SAMUEL. An Address to Normal-School Teachers of English. *Sch. Rev.*, March, 1900.
- YOUNG, WALTER H. The High Schools of New England and the College-Certificate Board. *Sch. Rev.*, February, 1907.